

CRISPUS (JOHN BAPTIST), a good Divine, and a good Poet, flourished in the XVIth Century, and was born at Gallipoli, in the Kingdom of Naples. The chief of his Books is that which was printed at Rome, in the Year 1594, in folio, *de Ethnicis Philosophis caute legendis* [A]. See Toppi's *Biblioteca Napoletana* (a). (d) Pag. 122.

[A] The chief of his Books is that *de Ethnicis Philosophis caute legendis*. Possévin speaks of it. Vir vere Philosophus qui nimirum acri & quali Christianum decet, judicio, Philosophiam expendit, librum fati grandem de Philosophis caute legendis ita scripsit, ut quæcunque hæreses à Philosophis minus caute manarunt, ex indicatæ, sint ac solidis rationibus confutatur, ex divinis Scripturis & Patribus, ex Synodorum decretis, ex Scholasticis, quibus cautionibus præmuniti Philosophi five publici Professores inoffenso pede curriculum hoc decurrent, tantamque ancillam recta adducent ad arcem (1). — A true Philosopher, who examined Philosophy with that nicety of Judgment, which becomes a Christian, wrote a considerable Treatise on the caution, which ought to be used in reading the Philosophers, wherein all the errors, which flowed from unguarded Philosophers, are pointed out, and confuted, by solid reasoning from the Holy Scriptures, the Fathers, the Decrees of Councils, and the Schoolmen. With which Precautions, Philosophers, or public Professors, being provided, may safely tread that Path, and lead the handmaid to the Temple. Father Marfenne has inserted a long Passage out of it in one of his Books (2): it is that wherein Crispus

confutes the mystical Divines. It is not improper to know the reason why Father Marfenne inserted that Passage; Because, says he, that Author, who is pretty scarce, has confuted that sort of Divines most elegantly. Quod attinet ad secretiores illos Theologos quos Venetus tam importune & tam frequenter inculcat, bene mihi philosophatus videtur Joannes Baptista Crispus, cujus hic ideo integram sententiam libet attere, præsertim cum autor ille rarissimus esse videatur, & elegantissimo stylo secretiores illos Theologos confutat (3). — As to those mystical Divines whom Venetus mentions so often, John Baptist Crispus seems to me to have justly reasoned, whose Opinion I shall here give at large; especially as that Author is very scarce, and as he confutes them with a peculiar Elegance of Style.

The other Works of Crispus are two Speeches about the War against the Turks, printed at Rome in the Year 1594, in 4to. *De Medicis laudibus, Oratio ad cives suos Gallipolitanos*, printed at Rome in the Year 1591, in quarto. The Life of Sannazar, printed at Rome in the Year 1589, and reprinted at Naples in the Year 1633, in octavo. The Plan of the City of Gallipoli, dedicated to Flaminio Caraccioli the first of January 1591 (4).

(1) Marinus Merfennus in Problem. Veneti, pag. 423.

(4) Taken from Toppi's Biblioteca Napoletana.

CRITIAS, a Disciple of Socrates, improved so little by that Philosopher's Instructions, that he became a very wicked Man. He shewed it chiefly, when the City of Athens, the Place of his Birth, being subdued by Lyfander, General of the Lacedæmonians, was subjected to thirty Tyrants. He was one of them, and the most unjust of them all (a). He did not only design to render the City of Athens most miserable, but also to make a Desert of all Attica [A]. It is said, that his Injustices prejudiced the People against Socrates [B], because their Refinement against the Scholar reflected upon the Master. Xenophon has confuted those, who maliciously imputed to Socrates the disorderly Lives of some of his Scholars [C]. It is certain, that Critias did not love Socrates, and that he forbade him

(a) Κριτίας μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἐν τῇ δημοκρατίᾳ πάντων πλεονεξικῶν καὶ βλαστήρων ἰσχυρότατος. Critias enim quum ad paucos pervenisset civitatis status, unus ex illis factus longe omnium avarissimus ac violentissimus fuit. Xenophon, de factis & dictis Socratis, lib. 1, pag. m. 415. See Remark [A].

[A] He designed to make a Desert of all Attica.] His Rancour against his Country appeared from the time that he retired into Teffaly, where he was continually speaking ill of the Athenians. He represented them as a People who had the worst Customs in the World. Διαβάλλων δ' Ἀθηναίους ὡς πλείστα ἀνθρώπων ἀμαρτανότας. Athenienses vero perfringens quod præ cæteris errarent maxime (1). Being returned to Athens, he did the Lacedæmonians many Services; he put Lyfander upon demolishing the Walls, and conspired with them to depopulate all Attica, and to reduce it into Meadows. Ἐπεὶ λαμπρὸς μὲν ἐλακάνισε, πρὸς δὲ τὰ τέρα, καθύρει δὲ διὰ λυσάνδρου τὰ τέχνη, ὥς δ' ἤλαυνε τὸν Ἀθηναίων τὸ σφαῖα ποι τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀφαιρεῖτο, πόλεμον λακωνικὸν εἰπὼν ἐς πάντας, εἰ τις τὸν Ἀθηναίων φεύγων[α] δέξαιτο, αὐτοῦσι τε καὶ μαίονσι τὸς τεύχεων[α] ὑπερβάλλειο, βυλεύματός τε ἀτόπῃ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐνυελάμβανεν ὡς μηλόβολος ἡ Ἀττικὴ ἀποφανῆσει τὴς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλης ἐκκεκορυθῆσα, κακίστος ἀνθρώπων ἐμοὶ γὰρ φαίνεται ἑυμπαίων, ὃν ἐπὶ κακίᾳ ὄνομα. Com ille aperte Lacedæmonius faveret, proderet sacra, per Lyfandrum mœnia destrueret, quoque Athenienses expulserat quominus in ulla Græciæ parte confliterent, prohiberet, Lacedæmonicum edicens bellum omnibus imminere si quis exultantem Atheniensem exciperet, truculentia & cædibus triginta tyrannos superaret, detestabileque consilium cum Lacedæmonius iniret ut Attica pecorum nutrix efficeretur, virorum armentis spoliata, his de causis mihi omnium hominum pessimus fuisse videtur qui ob scelera fuerunt famosi (2). — As he was evidently devoted to the Lacedæmonians, had not the least regard for the most sacred things, demolished the Walls by Lyfander, and forbade the Athenians, whom he banished, to remain in any part of Greece, threatening all, who should entertain them, with the Arms of Sparta, exceeded the whole Thrity in Cruelty and Tyranny, and entered into a most abominable Scheme, with the Lacedæmonians, of dispeopling Attica, and

making it a common Pasture; I look upon him as the worst of Men, even amongst those who have signalized themselves by their Villanies. He was the cause of the Death of Alcibiades; for Lyfander did not engage the Persians to make away with him, till he had been informed by Critias, and the other Tyrants of Athens, That the Order which he had established in that City would be soon overturned, if that Man was not destroyed. Critias ceterique tyranni Atheniensium certos homines ad Lyfandrum in Asiam miserunt, qui eum certiores facerent, nisi Alcibiadem sustulisset, nihil arum rerum fore ratum, quas ipse Athenis constitulisset. Quare si suas res gestas manere veller, illum persequeretur (3). — Critias, and the other Tyrants of Athens, sent to inform Lyfander in Asia, that, unless he dispatched Alcibiades out of the way, nothing which they had done at Athens would be of any effect. That therefore if he desired the continuance of what he had done, he must destroy him.

[B] His Injustices prejudiced the People against Socrates.] The Orator Æschines did not question it; for in one of his Orations, he spoke thus to the Athenians: Τυμὴς δ' Ἀθηναίους Σωκράτην μὲν τὸν σοφιστὴν ἀπεκρίνατε ἐπὶ Κερίαν ἰσχυρὰν πεπαιδευκὸς ἕνα τῶν τεύχεων, τὸν τὸν δῆμον καλῶσαντων. Vos, Athenenses, Socratem sapientem illum occidistis, quod Critiam institulisset unum XXX. virorum qui populum opprimerent (4). — Ye, O Men of Athens, put the wise Socrates to Death, because he had educated Critias, one of the XXX Oppressors of the People.

[C] Xenophon has confuted those, who maliciously imputed to Socrates the disorderly Life of some of his Scholars.] The Enemies of that Philosopher imputed to him all the Misery, that Critias and Alcibiades, two of his Disciples, brought upon the Athenians. Xenophon shews that this was very unjust: He says, That those two Scholars applied themselves to Socrates to learn the Art of Discouraging, which they intended to make use of to satisfy their exorbitant Ambition (5). He pretends, that tho' they were

(3) Corn. Nepos, in Alcibiade, cap. x. init.

(4) Æschines Orat. in Timarchum, pag. m. 194. B.

(5) Xenoph. de factis & dictis Socratis, lib. 1, pag. m. 415.

(1) Possévin Ap. p. r. Sac. Tom. II, pag. 117.

(2) At the end of his Observations & Emendations in Problema Georgii Veneti in Genesim.

(1) Philostratus in vitis Sophistarum, pag. 505.

(2) Idem, pag. 504, 505.

(b) Idem, pag. 417.

(c) Id. lib. 2, de Gestis Græcor.

(d) Philostratus in vitis Sophistarum, pag. 503.

(e) Xenoph. de Gestis Græc. lib. 2.

(f) Corn. Nepos in Thraſybulo, cap. 2.

to teach any body (b). One of the Crimes, that made him most hated, was his being the most zealous Promoter of the Death of *Theramenes*, and his endeavouring to hinder those, who were expelled from *Athens* by the Faction of the thirty Tyrants, from finding a Place of Refuge in Greece (c); for the Towns that should receive them were threatened with War (d). So many Persons were banished as were able to form a kind of a small Army, who resolved to return into the City by force, and to set it at Liberty. They possessed themselves of the *Piræus* under the Conduct of *Thraſybulus*; and, being forced to leave it, they were not disheartened (e), but maintained two Battles with great Vigour, and in the last they killed *Critias*, who fought valiantly (f). Such was the End of that Man, who was otherwise commendable for his Nobility [D], Eloquence [E], and Poetry

so little inclined to imitate *Socrates*, that, if God had put it to their Choice, either to die, or to be obliged to live as that Philosopher did, they would have chosen the First; yet they behaved themselves decently whilst they were under his Direction; they did not indulge their wicked Inclinations till they had left his School. Καὶ Κριτίας δὲ καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδης ἕως μὲν Σωκράτει συνήκον ἐδυνάσθησαν ἐκείνῳ χρωμένῳ συμμαχεῖν τὰν μὴ καλῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν κελεύειν. Itaque *Critias* atque *Alcibiades* dum *Socrati* consuetudine utebantur potuerunt illius subsidio pravius superare cupiditates (6). *Critias* fled into *Thessaly*, where he was spoiled by the Conversation he kept with very wicked Men (7). Others question whether he did not corrupt the *Thesſalians*; and they affirm, That he endeavoured to establish Tyranny among them (8). It was his Humour; he loved to bring Innovations and Broils in a State. *Xenophon* observes, that *Socrates* was not sparing in his reproofs to this Scholar (9): 'Perceiving that *Critias* was fallen in Love with *Euthydemus*, and that he endeavoured to obtain from him the last Favours which the Voluptuous desire, he endeavoured at first to divert him from that Design; telling him, That it was beneath a free Courage, and a Man of Honour, continually to importune a Man whose Esteem he desired to obtain, and to act the part of a Beggar for a thing dishonest. And because *Critias* did not yield to this first Attack, it is reported, that *Socrates* said, in the Presence of several Persons, and even of *Euthydemus*, that *Critias* had the Itching of a Swine, and was desirous to rub himself against *Euthydemus* as Swines do against Stones. Ever after, *Critias* bore him an ill Will; and in the Time of the Thirty Tyrants, of which Number he was, when he had the care of the Policy with *Charicles*, he remembered that Affront very well; and, to revenge himself, he made a Law, whereby he forbade to teach the Art of Reasoning in *Athens*.' I have set down this whole Passage as Mr *Charpentier* of the French Academy has translated it. Here is a Piece of it according to the Greek: Λέγεται τὸν Σωκράτην, ἄλλων τε πολλῶν παρόντων καὶ τῷ Εὐθυδήμῳ, εἰπεῖν ὅτι οὐκ ὀκνοῖν πάσχειν ὁ Κριτίας, ἐπιθυμῶν Εὐθυδήμῳ περισπᾶσθαι ὥσπερ τὰ βόδια τοῖς λίθοις. *Socratem* cum aliis multis præsentibus, tum etiam ipso *Euthydemō*, dixisse ferunt, *Critiam* in *Euthydemum* porcorum more, qui se saxis affricare solent, affici.

[D] He was commendable for his Nobility.] He was descended from *Dropides* the Brother of *Solon*. That *Dropides* was the Father of *Critias*, and he of *Caladesibrus*, who was the Father of our *Critias*. It is said that *Solon* descended from *Codrus* King of *Athens*, and that going back higher they found *Nelus* and *Neptune* among the Heads of his Race (10). I must observe by the by, that I wonder that *Proclus*, from a Passage of *Plato*, very fit to confute those who assert that *Dropides* was the Brother of *Solon*, should make a Commentary, wherein he declares for that Brotherhood, without answering the Objection which his Text may afford. *Critias* says there (11), That *Solon* had told *Dropides* a certain Story; for, adds he, *Solon* lived familiarly and in good friendship with *Dropides*, ἦν μὲν ἔν οικείῳ καὶ σφόδρῃ φίλος. Can such a Reason be alleged concerning two Brothers?

[E] For his Eloquence.] Here is what *Cicero* says of it: 'Huic ætati suppare *Alcibiades*, *Critias*, *Theramenes*, quibus temporibus quod dicendi genus vigeret, ex *Thucydidis* scriptis qui ipse tum fuit intelligi maxime potest: grandes erant verbis,

crebri sententiis, compressione rerum breves, & ob eam ipsam causam interdum subobscuri (12). — In this Age, and nearly at the same time, flourish'd *Alcibiades*, *Critias*, *Theramenes*; of the manner of speaking then in vogue, we may be informed in a great measure from *Thucydides*, who was contemporary; they were lofty, sententious, concise, and for that reason sometimes obscure.' *Dionysius Halicarnassensis* commends *Critias*'s Eloquence (13); but he represents it as quite different from that which *Cicero* has just described. It is plain that *Cicero* pretends, that in order to know *Critias*'s Eloquence, we need only consider the Style of *Thucydides*. Doubtless he pretends that the concise and sententious way of expressing one's self, that reigns in that famous Historian, was in vogue at that time, and that *Critias*, and the other Orators he names, followed no other Method in their Speeches. On the other side *Dionysius Halicarnassensis* assures us, that *Thucydides*, had no Imitators, and, to prove it, he refers his Readers particularly to *Critias*. 'Ad eos autem qui *Thucydidis* orationem ad veterem atque illis temporibus usitatum dicendi rationem referunt, neque obscuro neque prolixo mihi sermone opus erit. Quibus illud dici potest; cum multi essent *Athenis* & Oratores, & Philosophi, quo tempore bellum inter *Peloponnesios* atque *Athenienses* gerebatur, neminem tamen repetitum esse, qui hunc dicendi modum usurparit, neque *Andocidem*, neque *Antiphontem*, neque *Lyſiam*, qui Oratores erant: neque *Critiam*, neque *Antisthenem*, neque *Xenophontem*, qui *Socraticam* philosophandi rationem sectabantur (14). — In answer to those, who make the Language of *Thucydides* to be the antient and received manner of speaking, I shall neither have Occasion to be prolix or obscure, but only observe, that though, during the War between the *Peloponnesians* and the *Athenians*, there were at *Athens* many both Orators and Philosophers, yet were there none who followed the same Method, neither *Andocides*, *Antipho*, or *Lyſias*, who were Orators, nor *Critias*, *Antisthenes*, or *Xenophon*, who maintained the Principles of *Socrates*. *Cicero* speaks somewhat differently in another Place: He grants that *Critias* was less concise than *Thucydides*. I do not know why he makes some Difference, as to the Time, between *Critias* and *Alcibiades*; for they were certainly Contemporaries. I shall set down *Cicero*'s Words, whereby it will appear, that in his Time they had still some Writings of *Critias*. 'Antiquissimi fere sunt quorum quidem scripta consent, *Pericles*, atque *Alcibiades*, & eadem ætate *Thucydides*, subtile, acuti, breves, sententiis magis, quam verbis abundantes. Non potuisset accidere, ut unum esset omnium genus, nisi aliquem sibi proponerent ad imitandum. Consequitur sunt hos *Critias*, *Theramenes*, *Lyſias*. Multa *Lyſiæ* scripta sunt, nonnulla *Critiæ*, de *Theramenē* audivimus, omnes etiam tum retinebant illum Periclis succum, sed erant paulo uberiore filo (15).

— Amongst the most antient of those, whose Writings are still extant, are *Pericles*, *Alcibiades*, and their cotemporary *Thucydides*; subtil, keen, concise, rather abounding in Sentences than Words. It were impossible their Styles should be alike, unless they had taken some one for a Model. These were followed by *Critias*, *Theramenes*, and *Lyſias*. There are several pieces of *Lyſias*, and some of *Critias* still extant; of *Theramenes* we have heard; they all retained the Spirit of *Pericles*, but something more luxuriant in Style.' Father *Cassian* reckons *Critias* among the ancient Sophists, and praises him very much. 'Non obscuri quoque nominis inter veteres Sophistas

(12) *Cicero* in *Bruto*, cap. 7.

(13) See his *Opera* in *Rhetorica* & *Critica*, pag. 145, 228, 425. Edit. in 8vo, 1615.

(14) *Id.* pag. 425.

(15) *Cicero* de *Oratore*, lib. 2, cap. 22.

(10) *Diog. Laërtius* in *Platone*, lib. 2, n. 1. See also *Plato* in *Charmide*, pag. m. 463. C.

(11) In *Platon. Timæo*, pag. m. 1042. C.

Poetry [F]. He was more praised by Plato than by Proclus [G], who commented upon Plato. He has been reckoned one of those who dogmatized against the Existence of God [H]. I should not be surprized that Authors, indifferently

* Sophistas Critias, qui in gravi genere dicendi exercitissimus fuit. Nec tamen gravitatem verbis poeticis aut dithyrambicis metiebatur, sed vocabulis maxime propriis, ut natura postulat, concinnabat orationem. Insigni præterea brevitate & magna Atticissimi temperie loquutus, nihil habet insolens aut ineptum (16). — Critias bore no inconsiderable rank among the old Sophists, being a perfect Master of the majestic manner of speaking; nor yet did he swell his Discourse with poetical or sounding Expressions, but chose those which were most suitable to the nature of his subject. Besides he spoke with a peculiar conciseness, and a happy mixture of the Attic Elegance, so that nothing is uncouth or improper. He quotes Hermogenes in his Favour

(16) Caussin. de Eloquentia, lib. 2, pag. m. 18, 19.

(17) Ab Hermogene judicatur summo et dymanos pro dymanos. Ibid.

(17): I had rather inform my Readers, that Critias was one of the XXX Tyrants of Athens, than merely call him a Sophist. However, I own that Philostratus, giving too great a Latitude to that Word, placed Critias among the ancient Sophists. We have seen that he made a profligate Wretch of him; and we shall see that he praises him extremely for his Eloquence. Τὴν δὲ ἰδίαν τὴν λόφου δομασίας οὐ Κερίας καὶ πολυφώνων, συμφορολογίας τε ἱκανωτάτων, ἢ τὴν διθυραμβωδὴν συμφορολογίαν, ἢ δὲ καταργήσαντες τὰ ἐκ ποιητικῆς ὀνόματα, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν κυριαστικῶν συνημῆναι καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἔχουσιν, ὅρῳ τὴν ἀνδρα καὶ βεργυλοχρῆντα ἱκανῶς καὶ δυνάως, καθαρῶς ἀπολογίας ἵδρι ἀτλίκιζοντα τὴν ἀρετῆς, ἢ δὲ ἐκράλως. Genus vero orationis Critiae fuit sententiarum gravitate & judicio ornatum. Idem in gravi dicendi genere exercitissimus fuit, quam quidem gravitatem non dithyrambis intonabat, neque ad poetica verba confugebat, sed vocabulis maxime propriis concinnabat & ut natura postulat. Video namque hominem dicenti brevitate loquentem, & in defensione alios subtiliter carpentem. Item neque male neque immoderate Attica lingua differentem (18). — Critias, as to his Manner of writing, was solid and sententious, much inclined to the Majestic, but never rising to Bombast, or affecting Poetical Terms, expressing himself with Propriety, and agreeable to Nature. Metbinks I see him speaking with a becoming Gravity, and refuting Objections with Strength of Argument, and Attic Elegance. I omit the remaining part of his Character mentioned by Philostratus: He loved Paradoxes, and to represent one and the same Idea by several loose Strokes. Καὶ τὸ ἀσυνδύτως δὲ χωρὶς περὶβαλλὲν Κερίας δέω. Critia quoque decor est scolis diffusis uni loco inbæere (19). The Wind of his Eloquence fell often, but it was always softer and more pleasant than the Zephyrus (20). One of Philostratus's Letters informs us, that Critias and Thucydides took Gorgias for their Model, and that they were beholding to him for the Looseness of their Eloquence, attended with Facility in the one, and with Force in the other. Κερίας δὲ καὶ Θεκυδίδης ἐκ ἀγνοῦνται τὸ μεγαλόφωνον καὶ τὴν ὀρρὴν παρ' αὐτῶν κεκτημένοι μεταποιῦντες δὲ αὐτὸ εἰς τὸ οἰκείον, ὃ μὲν ὑπ' εὐλαττίας, δ' αὖ ὑπ' ὀργῆς. Critiam vero & Thucydidem non clam est magnitudinem animi & supercilium ab eo (Gorgia) accepisse. Transulerunt autem ad propria, alter ad lingue promptitudinem, alter ad robur (21).

(18) Philostratus in vitis Sophistarum, pag. 505.

(19) Id. Ibid. This may be justly said of Seneca.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Philostratus in Epist. ad Julianum Augustum, pag. 887.

(22) Plut. in Alcibiades, pag. 209, E.

(23) Idem, in Cimone, pag. 484, E.

[F] And for his Poetry. Plutarch mentions a Passage of Critias's Elegies, where the Author puts Alcibiades in mind that it was he who had caused him to be recalled, I mean, who had proposed to the People of Athens the Law that recalled him. It cannot be said, that the Author of those Elegies is another Critias, since Plutarch surnames him the Son of Callesibrus: Κρίτις τὸ Καλλιαισχρε γράφαντο ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐλεγεῖαις πεποιμένος. Ex Critia Callesibri filii rogatione, ut ipse hinc elegiis cecinit. And also citing the same Work elsewhere, he ascribed it to Critias one of the thirty Tyrants. Κερίας δὲ τῶν τεσκότων γερόμενος ἐν ταῖς ἐλῆγαις. Critias ex triginta tyrannis orat in elegiis (23). There is a Fault in the Life of Alcibiades translated by Amyot; instead of Critias the Son of Callesibrus, there is Callias the Son of

Callesibrus. The same Fault is in the Translation of Plato, by Serranus, in the Dialogue, intituled, Protagoras. There is Κερίας in the Greek, and Callias in the Translation. Plutarch is not the only Author who has cited the Elegies of Critias; you will find several Passages out of them in Athenæus: see Book 10, pag. 432, and Book 15, pag. 666. This last Passage informs us, that the Passage of the first Book, pag. 28, is taken from the same Work of Critias. I do not question but he composed some other Poems. It is not certainly known whether he was the Author of a Poem, intituled Pirithoüs; some ascribe it to him, and others to Euripides (24). We shall see hereafter whether he ought to be distinguished from the Author of the Book De Politia Lacedæmoniorum.

[G] He was more praised by Plato than by Proclus. Every body in this Town knows, that Critias is ignorant of none of the things we speak of. Κερίαν δὲ πᾶσι πάντες οἱ τῆς ἰσμεν ἰδῶντες ἰδιώτην ὄντα ἐν λόγῳ. Critiam vero omnes utique hæc in urbe, nullius eorum, quæ dicimus, esse imperitum scimus (25). This is the Encomium that Plato bestows upon him: now he had been speaking of the Advantages that accrue from an excellent Genius, and from the Study of good Philosophy: Proclus in commentario ad hunc locum: 'Ο Κερίας ἦν μὲν γενναῖος καὶ ἀδράς φύσεως, ἠπλῆστο δὲ καὶ φιλοσόφων συνεισῶν, καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο ἰδιώτης μὲν ἐν φιλοσόφοις, φιλοσοφῶν δὲ ἐν ἰδιώταις, ὡς ἡ ἰσῶρία φησιν. Erat quidem Critias generosa & vehementi indole, nec philosophicarum expers disceptationum; sed ita tamen ut idiotæ inter philosophos, philosophos inter idiotas vocaretur; ut quidem historia testatur. Quod significat hunc quidem non fuisse perfectum in philosophia, sed tamen ingenio aptum, & multæ eruditiois (26). — Proclus, in his Commentary on this Place, says: Critias had a noble and extensive Genius; he had likewise spent some time in Philosophy; but so as to be accounted a Novice amongst Philosophers, and a Philosopher amongst the Novices; as History relates. Which means, that he was no Adept in Philosophy, but a Man of a ready Genius, and great Learning. I observe upon these two last words of Petitus, that Proclus's Expressions do not seem to signify, that Critias had a great deal of Learning. A Man may pass for a Philosopher without it among ignorant People. Inter cæcos regnat strabus.

[H] He has been reckoned one of those that dogmatized against the Existence of God. Sextus Empiricus does not express this in obscure Terms. Θεὸς γὰρ, says he (27), οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ φασιν εἶναι τινὲς δὲ καὶ εἶναι ὥστε οἱ περὶ διαγῶραν τὴν Μήλιον, καὶ Θεόδοτον, καὶ Κερίαν τὸν Ἀθηναῖον. Most People believe that there are Gods, but some, as Diagoras, Theodorus, and CRITIAS the Athenian, say there are none. He explains that Man's Thoughts in another Book. Critias, says he (28), one of the XXX Tyrants of Athens, seems to be in the Number of Atheists. He pretends, that the ancient Lawgivers, designing to prevent any one from doing his Neighbour wrong in private, feigned that there is a Providence which takes notice whether Men live well or ill, and punishes them that do evil. According to his System, there had been a time when Men, being as disorderly as Beasts, and neither rewarding good Actions, nor punishing bad ones, followed no other Law than that of the strongest. Afterwards some Men enacted Punishments, and then Justice exercised it's Authority over Injustice, like a Master over his Slave. Those were punished that did any Evil. And then, when it was found that the Laws did indeed prevent Men from sinning publicly, but not from doing an ill Action privately, there arose a Man of Parts, who knew that he should do Mankind a very great Service, if he could order it so, that the Wicked should be afraid of being punished even when they should sin privately, or have an ill Design. He therefore invented a God, that is, an immortal Nature, which sees and knows all things: he ascribed to him the Government of the World, the Motion of the Heavens, Lightning and

(24) Athen. lib. 11, pag. 495.

(25) Plato in Timæo, pag. m. 1041, E.

(26) Petrus Petitus, Miscellanea. Observat. pag. 6.

(27) Sext. Emp. Pyrrhon. Hypotypos. lib. 3, pag. 155.

(28) Id. adversus Mathematicos, pag. 318.

rently versed in the reading of the Ancients, should be ignorant of that matter of Fact; but I think it somewhat strange, that the learned *Tanaquillus Faber* did not

(29) Plut. de
Placitis Philof.
lib. 1, quæst. 7,
pag. 88c, E.

Thunder, and all things in general that Men dread: Thus, concluded he, an ingenious Man made others believe the Existence of a Deity. *Sextus Empiricus* quotes *Critias's* own words, without naming the Book from which he takes them. We know only that he borrows them from a Poem; for he cites Iambic Verses. That which perplexes the thing is, that *Plutarch* ascribes the same Verses to *Euripides*, and supposes that this Poet, fearing the *Areopagites*, and not daring to publish his Atheism directly, caused this wicked Syllem to be set forth by a Person represented on the Stage (29). Εὐεπίδης ὁ τρα-
γῆδοποιὸς ἀποκαλύψασθαι μὲν ἐκ ὑβίλης,
δεδικαίως τὸν "Ἀρεῖον πάγον" ἐπέφησε δὲ τῶτον
τὸν τρόπον. τὸν γὰρ Σίσυφον εἰσαγαγε περὶ τὴν
ταύτης τῆς δόξης, καὶ συνηγοροῦσαν αὐ-
τῇ ταῦτα τῇ γνώμῃ, "Ὡν γὰρ χρεόν (φασὶν)
ἔτ' ἀτακτῶς ἢν ἀνθρώπων βίη, καὶ θνητῶν,
ἰσχυρὸν δ' ὑπέρβηται. ἐπέφα οὖσι τὴν ἀνομίαν
λυθῆναι νόμον εἰσαγαγῶν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ὁ νόμος
τὰ φανερά τῶν ἀδικημάτων εἰργάν ἐδύνατο,
κρυφα τε ἴδμεν πολλοὶ, τότε τίς σοφὸς ἀνὴρ
ἐπέστηεν ὥς δέ τι αἰετὶ λίσσῃ τυφλῶσαι
τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ πείσαι τὰς ἀνθρώπων, ὥς
ἔστι δαίμων ἀφ' ἧτος θάλλον βίη, "Ὅς ταῦτ'
ἀκέραι καὶ βλάπτει φρονεῖ τ' ἄγαν. *Euripides*
tragicus Poeta aperte quidem profiteri hanc sententiam non est ausus, metuens *Areopagiticum* judicium: indicavit tamen hac ratione: *Sisyphum* introduxit, qui eam proferret, ipseque ei patrocinatus est,

Incondita olim vita fuit mortalium,
Et belluina, viribusque serviens.

Legibus deinde positis ait injustitiam fuisse repressam. Sed cum hæ aperta possent flagitia prohibere, multi autem occulte scelera perpetrant, tum quendam callidum virum prodidisse, qui docuerit veritati tenebras mendacio offundendas, hominibusque persuadendum esse,

Quod sit perenni vita aliquis vicens Deus,
Qui cernat ista, & audiat, atque intelligat.

— *Euripides, the Tragedian, dreading the Censure of the Areopagites, dared not publicly declare himself; but effected it after this manner. He introduced Sisyphus to broach this Opinion, and then patronized it himself. His Words are,*

Man like a lordly Savage once untam'd
Scour'd the wild Desert, nor would Homage pay
But to superior Power.

He afterwards observes, that these Irregularities were checked by the Introduction of Laws. But whereas those could only restrain Men from open Acts of Injustice, and Men would still be wicked in the Dark; that then,

Some subtil Politician rose, who taught
To varnish Falshood with a specious Dye:

That he likewise instilled a Notion into the credulous Part of Mankind, that there was

Some God immortal, whose all-seeing Eye,
And ever-open Ear, all Secrets know.

It is manifest, that the System mentioned by *Sextus Empiricus*, and that which *Plutarch* speaks of, are both alike. They only differ in this, that *Plutarch* does not quote so many Verses as *Sextus Empiricus*, and that he attributes to *Euripides* what the other ascribes to *Critias*. But the Verses, quoted by *Plutarch*, are exactly the same with some of those that *Sextus Empiricus* quotes. An Enquiry may be made upon this, whether, through want of Memory, too frequent among Authors great and small, what belongs to *Euripides* has not been ascribed to *Critias*, or vice versa; or whether there is any other way of solving the Difficulty? It seems to me that a Physician of Paris has been pretty lucky in his Conjectures.

He thinks there is a Gap in *Sextus Empiricus*; I mean, that the Transcribers have skipped some Periods, which contained what was cited out of *Critias*, and the notice that was given that *Euripides*, imbued with the same Opinion, had fully explained it in a Tragedy. 'Mihi probabilis videtur mutilum esse *Empirici* librum quam *Plutarchi*, nec ea modo quæ ex *Critia* citabat ævo substracta, sed etiam ipsius verba illa quibus *Euripidem* eorum versuum auctorem laudabat antequam versus ipsos poneret. Quo sane factum putandum est ut is qui lacunam non adverteret, idem versus *Critia* adscribi ac nomine ejus citari ab *Empirico* viderentur (30). Those who know that some very ancient and pretty good Manuscripts do not contain all that is to be found in others, and yet that no Blanks have been left in them, will own that it is very possible that the Manuscripts of *Empiricus* should be curtailed in that place, though the words are continued. But though I approve *Petitus's* Conjecture, yet I do not admit of all his Reasons: and I am going to shew those that seem to be false.

I. He says, that, according to *Plutarch*, the Reason that obliged *Euripides* to put out his System under the Person of *Sisyphus*, was for fear of the *Areopagites*; now, adds he, that Fear is not likely in such a Man as *Critias*, a cruel and violent Tyrant, who laughed both at humane and divine Laws. 'Non videtur is metus in tyrannum cadere qualis fuisse *Critias* dicitur impotens, sævus, juris humani oblitus, & Deorum contemptor (31). This Reason has no force; for *Critias's* Tyranny did not begin till after the taking of *Athens*: before that time he was only considered proportionably to his Intrigues, and was no less answerable for his Behaviour than another. So that if he would have composed a piece for the Stage, he had been obliged to be as cautious as *Euripides* more or less. The People and the Tribunals of *Athens* could have brought him as easily to reason as they did *Alcibiades* under pretence of Impiety (32). It is very probable, that if *Critias* had made Tragedies, it was not after he became one of the XXX Tyrants, but when he was more at leisure. At the worst it is very possible that he might have made them before he was a Tyrant: which is sufficient to confute the Reason I am here to oppose.

II. Here is another that is not stronger. *Critias* was not so good a Poet, that one may ascribe to him such fine Verses as those quoted by *Empiricus*. How shall we reconcile this with *Athenæus*, who quotes so many good Verses of *Critias*, and even calls him a very good Man (33); and lastly cites a Piece that was looked upon as a Work of *Critias*, or of *Euripides*? When the Public doubts whether a Poem be the Work of one of the first rate Authors that are known, or of another, they must be persuaded that That other is a very good Poet.

III. What *Petitus* adds, that since *Plato* (34) reproached *Euripides* with flattering Tyrants, and praising Tyranny, the Fear of the *Areopagites* becomes that Poet much better than *Critias*, seems to me a wrong Argument: For, generally speaking, there is no Connexion between preferring Monarchy before a Commonwealth, and being afraid of speaking one's Mind about Religion. The Praises of Tyranny, for which *Euripides* was reproached, are only some Passages in his Tragedies, wherein he describes the Advantages of a Monarchical Government: and it is not strange that in a City like *Athens*, wherein the Republican Government was an endless cause of Revolutions and Confusions, a Man of Parts should be affected with Maxims favourable to Monarchy. 'Magis profecto *Euripidi* convenit, quod ait *Plutarchus*, non ausum metu *Areopagi* aperire mentem suam de Diis, propterea *Sisyphi* personam ab eo inductam. N A M & *Plato* *Euripidi* obijcit in octavo de Republica, quod tyrannis impensius faveret, & tyrannidem laudaret (35).—What *Plutarch advances is more agreeable to the Character of Euripides, namely, that out of a fear of the Areopagites he durst not declare himself, and therefore introduced the Character of Sisyphus. For a Plato, in the eighth Book De Republica, objects against Euripides for too strenuously favouring Tyrants, and commending*

(30) *Petrus Petitus*, Obferuat. Miscellan. lib. 1, cap. 1, pag. 7.

PETITUS's Reasons examined.

(31) *Petit*, ibid. pag. 5.

(32) See *Cornelius Nepos* in vita *Alcibiadis*.

(33) 'Ο ὑπερίστος ἔργων. Optimus *Critias*. *Athen.* lib. 13, pag. 600.

(34) *Libr. 8, de Republ.*

(35) *Petit* lib. 7, pag. 6, 7.

not know it [1]. The Place where *Sextus Empiricus* speaks of it has exercised one

'commending Tyranny.' But to leave this, the Question is not to vindicate *Euripides*'s Notion about Government, but to enquire whether, because he spoke sometimes in Commendation of a Monarchical Government, it was necessary for him to use the Artifice that *Plutarch* ascribes to him: which is, that, being afraid of the *Areopagites*, he brought in *Sisyphus*, in one of his Tragedies, venting the impious Doctrine, which he durst not give out as his own. One cannot easily perceive that one of those two things may be the Consequence of the other: it appears plainly, that, though he had inveighed against a Kingly Government, in favour of a Republican one, Prudence would have taught him, that it was necessary for him to use some Art in the publishing of an impious Doctrine, to avoid being prosecuted for it by the *Areopagites*. I grant that, if one consider well the matter, it will appear, that his praising a Monarchical Government might have made him unacceptable to the Magistrates of *Athens*, and that consequently he should have thought himself obliged to be more cautious than another, and to give no occasion for a Prosecution. But, at the Bottom, *Petitius*'s Conjecture would be disputable (36); and however it cannot be denied, that this does not clearly appear to be his meaning, as he has expressed himself (37).

IV. If *Plato*'s Reproach against *Euripides* had been alledged only as a Principle of the Conclusion that I am going to examine, I would not have found fault with *Petitius*'s Arguments in the way I have done; I should easily have perceived some Connexion between the two things that he concludes the one from the other. He argues thus: Since *Euripides* praised Tyranny, and warmly maintained the Cause of Tyrants, it is probable that he vented upon the Stage the Maxims that are imputed to him; for those Maxims are very pleasing to Tyrants. 'Quidni igitur Euripides tyrannis amicus, & Archelao Macedonum regi haud sane admodum laudato, in amoribus, hanc sententiam in ea tragedia tyrannorum moribus confutandam protulerit: utpote quibus religio nihil aliud sit, nisi machina theatralis, qualem poetæ habent in promptu, ad expediendum fabulæ quempiam nodum (38). — Why then might not Euripides, a Friend to Tyrants, and much caressed by Archelaus, King of Macedon, who does not bear the best of Characters, advance this Opinion, agreeable to the Manners of Tyrants; whose Religion is nothing but a Theatrical Machine, which Poets have in readiness, to solve some Difficulty in the Play.' Thus far he is in the right; I mean, that whoever admits the Principle, must admit the Consequence: but it falls out unluckily, that there is a false Proposition in that Argument. It is not true, that whoever goes about to take off the Impressions of Religion, does a thing acceptable to a Tyrant. Those who are so ignorant and so unreasonable, as not to ascribe the Origin of Religion to the Impressions that God himself has communicated to Mens minds, find no Supposition more plausible than to say, that those who had a Mind to govern have invented Religion, to keep the People more easily under the Yoke. History affords us a thousand Instances of the Advantages that Princes have drawn from the Superstitions of the People, whether they were to be encouraged, or terrified. An Oracle of *Delphi*, an Answer of the Augurs, the Explication of a Prodigy, have been of great use in a thousand Cases for the Interest of Sovereigns. So that, tho' by the same Machines People may be made to revolt (39), it is nevertheless probable, that because all the Inconveniences that may arise from an Invention cannot be foreseen, understanding and cunning Sovereigns would have forged a Religion, if they had not found one already established. *Petitius* is therefore in the wrong to suppose that *Euripides*, in order to make his Court to Tyrants, and particularly to *Archelaus*, King of *Macedonia*, caused a long part to be acted on the Stage with design to destroy Religion. Is any thing more proper to ruin it, than to make People believe that it was only invented to serve for a Scarecrow, and that it is a Chimera to pretend that Thunder, Hail, and Storms, are Punishments that God makes use of against wicked Men? *Petitius* has so plainly confuted himself, that one cannot but wonder at it: Tyrants,

says he (40), laugh at Religion, they do not mind it; nevertheless, they use all imaginable means to make their Subjects obedient to Religion: and consequently, (he may be answered) *Euripides* would have made his Court very ill to Tyrants, if he had vented upon the Stage such an impious Doctrine as that mentioned by *Sextus Empiricus* and *Plutarch*.

It seems to me that *Petitius* forgot one of the Reasons, which prove, that it is *Euripides*, and not *Critias*, who dogmatized in that manner. He should have said, that it is an usual thing with *Euripides* to bring some Persons on the Stage who utter Impieties. His *Bellerophon* inveighs very boldly against the Divine Providence, and concludes against it from the Disorders that are to be seen in the World, and the continual Oppression of Innocency (41). To conclude, I shall observe, that *Petitius* has quoted a long Passage of *Seneca*, whereby it appears, that This Philosopher looked upon what the Ancients have said of *Jupiter*'s Thunderbolt as a pious Fraud. 'Quid tam imperitum est, quam credere fulmina è nubibus Jovem mittere — ut impunitis sacrilegis, percussis ovibus, incensis aris, pecudes innoxias feriat. — Si quis aris me quid sentiam, non exillimo tam habetis fuisse, ut crederent Jovem, aut non æque voluntatis, aut certe minus paratum esse. Utrum enim cum emi sit ignes, quibus innoxia capita percuteret, scelesti transiret, aut noluit justius mittere, aut non successit? Quid ergo secuti sunt, cum hoc dicent? ad coercendos animos imperitorum sapientissimi viri judicaverunt, inevitabile metum, ut supra nos aliquid timeremus. Utile erat in tanta audacia scelerum, aliquid esse adversum quod nemo sibi satis potens videretur. Ad conterendos itaque eos, quibus innocentia nisi metu non placet, posuere super caput vindicem & quidem armatum' (42). — What can be more ridiculous than to imagine, that *Jupiter* hurls Thunder from the Clouds — that he should strike harmless Sheep, burn Altars, and suffer impious Wretches to escape with Impunity. — If you ask my Opinion, I cannot imagine Men to have been so stupid as to believe *Jupiter*, either partial in his Judgment, or defective in Power: For when he throws his Thunder, which strikes the Innocent, and spares the Guilty, is it want of Justice, or does he miss his Aim? Where then is the Consequence of this Assertion? In order to check the Minds of the Ignorant, the wiser sort thought it necessary to establish a dread of something above, and of an inevitable Punishment; it was of use, in a daring Age of Impiety, to set up some Power, which none could think himself able to oppose. Therefore to keep those in awe, who chase Innocence only out of Fear, they placed over their Heads an armed Avenger.' Note, that *Seneca* does not deny that *Jupiter* darts his Thunderbolt, if by *Jupiter* the Soul of the World be understood, which produces, governs, and directs all things, which may be called Fate, Providence, Nature, World, and which, properly speaking, is nothing else but the Universe itself. *Ipse enim est totum quod videt, totus suis partibus inditus, & se sustinent vi sua* (43). The *Spinozists* would easily approve this Thought. When *Seneca* is asked why this *Jupiter* strikes what ought to be spared, and spares what ought to be struck, he desires some time to prepare an Answer. At quare *Jupiter* aut ferientem transit, aut innoxia ferit? In majorem me questionem vocas, cui suus locus, suus dies dandus est (44).

[1] *Tanaquillus Faber* did not know it.] He plainly shews it in his Note on these words of *Plutarch*: Τι δὲ Καρχηδονίους ἐν ἐλευσίλει Κερίαν λαβόντων ἢ Διαγόραν νομοθετῆν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, μήτε τινὰ θεῶν μήτε δαιμόνων νομίζεν; ἢ τοιαῦτα εἶναι οἷα τῷ Κρόνῳ ἔθνον. Nonne utilis erat Carthaginensibus jam inde ab initio Critia vel Diagora ad condendas leges adhibito decernere nullum esse Deum, nullum genium: quam talia sacra facere qualibus illi Saturno operabantur (45). — How much better would it have been for the Carthaginians to have had a Critias and a Diagoras for their first Legislators, who believed neither Gods nor Spirits, than to offer such Sacrifices to Saturn as they did? Here is his Note: 'I know very well that *Critias*,

(40) Cum enim neque religionis respectum habuerit, id tamen molis omnibus student, ut quibus imperant populi, religioni maxime parent. *Petit. lib. 1, pag. 7.*

(41) See Remark [A] of the Article EURIPIDES. See also la Mothe le Vayer, Tom. XII, Letter 155, pag. 220, & Athenæus in Legat. pro Christian. pag. m. 28, & Clem. Alexandrin. in Admonit. ad Gentes, pag. 50.

(42) Seneca Natur. Quest. lib. 2. cap. 42.

(43) Seneca, Id. ibid. cap. 45.

(44) Ibid. cap. 46.

(45) Plut. de Superst. sub fin. pag. 171.

(36) I speak thus, because it is certain that *Petitius* had no such Thought.

(37) Compare the first Edition of this Dictionary with the second.

(38) *Petit. lib. 1, pag. 7.*

(39) See above, Remark [B] of the Article A-B-DAS.

(g) Dr. Petit, a Physician at Paris. See Remark [H]. one of our modern Critics (g). Moreri had but little Information concerning this Particular [K], and Vossius could not serve him for a sufficient Guide [L].

'was a passionate, furious, and unjust Man; in short, the fiercest of the XXX Tyrants. But the Question is here about a Philosopher, and not a Tyrant: Wherefore I believe that instead of Critias it must be read Theodorus, who was formerly one of the most famous Atheists of Greece. I shall be told that between these two Words Κριτίας and Θεόδωρος there is almost no resemblance in the Letters that compose them; but it must be remembered, that the Greek Transcribers do commonly so abbreviate the Words that begin with Θεο, that they write Θεωρος with a little stroke on the Θ. However it be, Critias is a fault.' Here is a definitive Sentence, that would not have escaped that Critic, if he had known what is to be found in Sextus Empiricus concerning Critias. A Father of the Church (46) has placed this Critias among the Atheists.

[K] Moreri had but little information concerning this Particular.] He should not have spoken in the singular Number of an Elegy of Critias, since Plutarch and Athenæus made use of the plural. II. He would not have said, that the Philosopher Sextus quotes a fine Fragment of his, if he had known that this Fragment contains an abominable Doctrine, down-right Atheism. III. Critias the Son of Calleschbrus should not be an Article by itself; he is the same Critias that was one of the XXX Tyrants. IV. There are no good Reasons to give us one Critias, a Greek Historian, different from the Son of Calleschbrus; as we shall see in the following Remark. V. The Testimony mentioned by Clemens Alexandrinus is not very advantageous to that Author; for that Father cites only (47) some Words of Critias, to shew that he was a Plagiary of Euripides. That which deceived Moreri is, that he did not understand all the force of these Latin Words of Vossius, *Illustræ hujus Scriptoris testimonium adducit Clemens* (48). This signifies only that Clemens Alexandrinus cites Critias, on a remarkable Subject. Now this does not import that he praises and esteems Critias. VI. Moreri should not have questioned that he, whom Plutarch cites in the Life of Lycargus, is the same who wrote concerning the Republic of Sparta, and whom Athenæus quotes twice. We shall quickly see that it is a certain Truth.

[L] Vossius could not serve him for a sufficient Guide.] He believed, without any reason, that Critias the Son of Calleschbrus was not the same that composed Elegies, and who was one of the XXX Tyrants (49). It is easy to see that it is one and the same Critias; and I wonder that Vossius did not perceive it: he says in express Words, that Critias the Tyrant had inscribed an Elegy to Alcibiades (50): now Plutarch cites an Elegy of Critias the Son of Calleschbrus, wherein the Author spoke to Alcibiades (51): is it not plain then, that Critias the Tyrant, and the Elegiac Poet, and the Son of Calleschbrus, are one and the same Person? Vossius was not always ignorant of it; for he acknowledged in his Greek Historians, that Critias, whose Verles are mentioned by Plutarch in the Life of Alcibiades, is the Son of Calleschbrus (52). We read also in Athenæus, that Critias the Son of Calleschbrus made some Elegies. As for Critias the Author of a Treatise of the Republic of Lacedæmon, Vossius should not have thought (53), but known, that it is he whom Plutarch quotes in the Life of Lycargus (54). In order to prove it, it is sufficient to say that Athenæus, relating the same thing that Plutarch mentions,

alleges Critias, Author of the Treatise of the Republic of Lacedæmon, for his Authority. Vossius says, that this Critias is not the Son of Calleschbrus, but gives no reason for it; and therefore as I would not affirm that he is in the wrong, neither would I be positive that what he says is true. It might be that the same Critias, who was a Scholar of Socrates, and one of the XXX Tyrants, had a mind to shew the Public that he was at once a Poet, an Orator, and an Historian. He left some Orations; Cicero and Dionysius Halicarnassensis had read them: he left some Poems; Plutarch and Athenæus (55) quote them: why should he not be the same that composed a Treatise of the Republic of Lacedæmon? I observe that Athenæus cites a Passage out of Critias's Elegies, wherein mention is made of the different ways of drinking at a Feast. Critias praises very much the Custom that was observed at Lacedæmon in that respect: they drank no body's health; they did not drink round; they did not run into any Excess; they observed a certain Medium that revived the Martial Humour, and the Mirth of the Conversation: in a Word, it was beneficial to the Body and the Mind; it made a Man fit for the Functions of Love, and provoked a good Sleep.

(55) Athen. lib. 11, pag. 403.

Οἱ Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ κέρι πίνασι τοῦτον,
ὥς φρέν' εἰς ἱλαρὴν ἀσπίδα πάντ' ἐ-
πάγειν,
εἰς τε φιλοφροσύνην γλώτταν μέτεόν τε
γέλωτα.
Τοιαύτη δὲ πόσις σώματι τ' ἀφελίμος,
Γνώμη τέ, κτήσσει τε καλὸς εἰς ἔργ' Ἀ-
φροδίτης,
Πρὸς δ' ὕπνον ἥρμους, τὸν καμάτων λι-
μένα.

Lacedæmonii juvenes eoque bibunt,
Ut ad capendum scutum alacres totum animum
vertant:
Lingum verò ad hilaritatem, modestumque ri-
sum:
Ea nimirum potatio corpori utilis est,
Ac menti: juvatque multum ad Veneris opus,
Nec parum ad somnum confert, qui laborum
portus est (56).

(56) Id. lib. 10, cap. 9, pag. 432.

The Spartan Youth with caution sinks the Bowl,
Not to inflame, but warm his generous Soul.
For moderate cups a genial power dispense,
Health, Vigour, Mirth, soft Sleep, and pleasing
Sense.
By them inspir'd, the Hero meets th' alarms
Of War's dread GOD, or Beauty's softer charms.

(57) Id. lib. 11, cap. 3, pag. 453. Vossius thought that Athenæus has only quoted that Book twice. I find it quoted thrice. Harpocration quotes it at the Word Λυσιππείας.

I observe also, that the same Author cites Critias's Work about the Republic of Lacedæmon (57), to shew the different ways of drinking: and this Critias makes the same Observation that I have already mentioned, which is, that the Lacedæmonians drank no Health. This will rather prove that there is here but one Critias, than that there are two. Note, that Julius Pollux, who quotes Critias a great many times, without naming any Book, names the Ἀταλάντη (58) once, and the Treatise of Republics once (59).

(58) Κριτίας δὲ ἐν Ἀταλάντῃ. Jul. Pollux, lib. 7, cap. 10.

(59) Παρὰ Κριτίας ἐστὶν ἐν ταῖς πολιτευσιαῖς. Id. lib. 1, cap. 13.

CRITO. Several ancient Authors have born This Name. I shall not repeat what Moreri says of them; I shall only correct some of his Faults [A].

[A] I shall only correct some of his Faults.] I. Crito the Athenian lived indeed in the XCIVth Olympiad, but not in the 150th Year of Rome: Moreri should have said the Year 350. II. I own he was one of the Disciples of Socrates; but it is false that Diogenes Laërtius tells us so, and yet he is the only Author that Moreri quotes: he should have quoted Xenophon (1). I shall clear this at the end of this Remark. III. Crito had no Son whose Name was Ctesippus; it should be Ctesippus. IV. Crito the

Physician did not teach an Art of Politeness, which Galen says ought to be excused, because he exercised Physic with Kings and Ladies. Would not one think that this Physician published some Books concerning Civility, not for the use of Children, but concerning the Civility of grown Men, and even a higher Civility than that of the Galatæus of Monsignor della Casa? Would not one think that he was the Chevalier de Méré of his time, and that he published some Treatises of Delicacy, which de-
ved

(46) Theophilus ad Autolyicum, lib. 2, pag. m. 121.

(47) Stromat. lib. 2, pag. 620. D.

(48) Voss. de Hist. Græc. pag. 348.

(49) Id. de Poëtis Græc. pag. 44.

(50) Ibid.

(51) Plut. in Alcib. pag. 209. E.

(52) Voss. de Hist. Græc. pag. 348.

(53) Puto & eundem Critiam esse cujus Plutarchus mentionem facit in Lycurgo. Id. ib. pag. 45.

(1) Xenophon, de Fact. & Dict. Socratis, lib. 1, pag. m. 418. See also Suidas in Κριτῶν.

ved that Title better than Father *Boubours's* Apology against *Cleantes*? And yet he did nothing of all this; he was contented to teach that part of Physic that is called *Cosmetic*. It is that which undertakes to cure the Ugliness and other Imperfections of the Body, which are apt to give married People a disgust of one another. That part of Physic is not the most minded; but it is pretended that it may be of great use even with respect to the Salvation of the Soul, since it may prevent Adulteries. 'Ad medicinam etiam pertinet Cosmetice: quæ ars non debet reprehendi, si quis recte utatur. Nam & mariti quandoque levibus uxorum vitiiis offensus amorem ad concubinas, vel etiam meretrices, imo & alienas uxores applicant. Quandoque & homines bene natos inque honore constitutos pudet cum ejusmodi vitiiis in publicum prodire. Itaque nec Galenus dubitavit in Arte sua tradere complura, quæ ad artem κοσμητικὴν pertinent: ut de iis quæ pulcrum vultui colorem conciliant: quæ maculas, scabritiem, aut rugas tollant: quæ capillis colorem mutant: quæ dentes albos reddant (2).

— Cosmetics are a part of Physic, which, if rightly applied, ought not to be condemned; for Husbands sometimes taking an Antipathy to their Wives, from some trifling Imperfection, keep company with loose Women, or other Men's Wives. And sometimes Men of distinguished Rank and Quality are ashamed to appear in public with such Blemishes. Wherefore Galen did not stick to insert amongst his other Works, several things which relate to the Cosmetic Art, as what will give a lively Colour to the Face, take away Pimples, Sturs, or Wrinkles, change the Colour of the Hair, or make the Teeth white. Physicians distinguish it commonly from that dishonest Art, that supplies Painting and all those fine Drugs, which *Ovid* set forth in his Poem *De Medicamine Faciei* (3). They have endeavoured to mend that Fault in the Dutch Edition of *Moreri's* Dictionary; but they could not succeed in it, because they could not believe that it was so gross as it is. He taught his Art with a Politeness, which Galen says ought to be excused, &c. This is the Correction of *Moreri's* Words, which is certainly wrong, but very excusable; for who could have imagined that, since it is said three lines after that *Crito* was the Inventor of the Cosmetic Art, they should not have distinguished in him Politeness from Cosmetics. *Moreri's* Blunder does not appear in it's full extent, unless one examine the Author, he pretends to follow, viz. *Vossius*. Now these are *Vossius's* Words: 'He *Crito* docuit artem κοσμητικὴν, five comortiam vel exornatoriam: qua in re, ut Galenus ait, veniam meretur quia apud reges & reginas medicinam faceret (4). — This *Crito* taught the Art of Cosmetics, or that of beautifying, wherein, as Galen says, he deserves to be excused, because he was Physician to Kings and Queens.' By these Words it is plain, that the pretended Art of Politeness, that Galen would have to be excused, is nothing else but Cosmetics. Doubtless *Moreri* had read in some other Book that *Crito* had taught artem po-

liendi cutem, the Art of making the Skin smooth, and taking off the Spots, &c. He took no notice of the Word *cutem*, and from the rest he made the pretended Art of Politeness. But *Vossius*, who was his usual Author, and his perpetual Oracle, might easily have set him right here. *V. Moreri* has not translated *Vossius* right, when he says that *Galen* has given the Catalogue of *Crito's* Works (5). He should have said, that he gave the Summary of them. VI. It is not true, that these Words of *Vossius*, docuit artem κοσμητικὴν, signify that *Crito* was the first Inventor of Cosmetics: there is a very great Difference between a Physician who makes a certain part of Physic his chief Study, and a Physician who is the first Inventor of that part. *Crito* being a Court Physician, and perceiving that Princes and Princesses are as desirous to be rid of a Redness, or of Freckles, and in general of all the Defects of the Skin, as to be cured of a Dilemper, applied himself altogether to Cosmetics: But this does not prove that no Body had treated of it before him. VII. Lastly, *Moreri* defines *Cosmetic* very ill: It is, says he, the Art that takes care of the Beauty and Ornaments of the Body. According to this Definition, Cosmetic would contain the Art of Dressing the Head, choosing a proper Dress, and sorting Jewels, in a Word, all the Industry of the Women who dress a Bride on her Wedding-day. Now this is very false.

Let us see whether I was in the right as to the second part of this Criticism. It has been objected to me (6), that *Diogenes Laërtius*, speaking of *Crito's* Affection for Socrates, and placing him in the number of the Socraticians, says clearly enough what *Moreri* attributes to him. I answer, That the Disciples of a Philosopher are not the only Persons that can shew him a great deal of Affection; and therefore what *Diogenes Laërtius* relates of *Crito's* Affection for Socrates, is not a Proof that favours *Moreri*. I add, that he has placed some Philosophers between Socrates and *Crito*, that were neither Socrates's Scholars nor Followers, and consequently it cannot be concluded that he put *Crito* in the number of the Socraticians; I say, it cannot be concluded from the place he gives him in his second Book. Nay he observes in express Words, that the Sons of *Crito* were Socrates's Scholars, οἱ παῖδες δὲ αὐτοῦ διηκουσας Σωκράτους, ipsius liberi Socratis auditores fuerunt (7). Having said nothing like it concerning *Crito*, it is natural to believe that he did not design to inform us of the thing, for which he has been cited in *Moreri's* Dictionary. I even observe, that *Plato* introduces Socrates saying that *Crito* was as old as he, and Father of *Critobulus*, who was his Scholar (8). That Philosopher had then all the reason in the World to place the Father as well as the Son in the number of his Scholars; yet he gives that Quality only to the Son. However, I confess that *Plato* gives clearly to understand in some other places (9), that *Crito* ought to be reckoned among the Scholars of Socrates.

(5) * *Αναγκαῖον* ἀναλυσιν libri-
rum ejus exhibet
Galenus, lib.
1. τῶν κατὰ
τέχνης. *Vossius*,
ibid.

(6) See *Moreri* of the Dutch Edition, 1698, Tom. II, pag. 293.

(7) *Diog. Laërt.* lib. 2. n. 121.

(8) *Plato* in *Apolo-*
gia Socratis,
pag. m. 26.

(9) It is not in the Dialogue intitled, *Phædrus*; but it is chiefly in the Dialogue intitled *Phædon*.

(10) Thus he is named in Father *du Breul's* Antiquities of Paris, pag. 554. Father *Lalbé*, Bibliotheca Bibliothecæ, pag. m. 71, names him *William*. He is called *James* in the *Sorberiana*. I believe we must keep to Father *du Breul*.

CRITON (GEORGE) (a), a Scotchman, was Greek Professor in the Royal College at Paris. He was a zealous Papist [A]. He married the Daughter of a Scotch

[A] He was a zealous Papist. Mr Gillot writes thus to *Scaliger* (1). 'You must know, that within these few Days, *Criton*, Professor of humane Languages, desiring to be made Doctor of the Canon-Law, proposed Theses in the Civil and Canon-Law to dispute publicly; which having been seen by the King's Council, they found one of them contrary to the old and sound Doctrine of France, of the Sorbonne, and of Truth: to wit, Nec Hierarcha Romanus (ad quem solum auctoritas tibi apostolicis discessibus Jurisdictionis spiritualis in Christianis omnes, in patrimonio Ecclesiæ temporalis etiam potestas pertinet) nec Princeps solutus est legibus tamen uterque alios his solvere possit, & hic comitibus, ille Conciliis sit superior, &c. — Neither the Roman Pontiff (to whom appertains the spiritual Jurisdiction over all Christians, as also a Temporal Power, within the Patri-mony of the Church) nor any Prince are exempted from the Laws, though each can exempt others: The one being superior in Courts, the other in Councils,

&c.' And in another, speaking of Excommunication, he says: Quod nulla cogitatione nonnunquam incurritur, & ob unius noxam familiam omnem & civitatem plerumque ferit. — That it is sometimes incurred by mere Thoughts, and often involves a whole Family or Town, for one Person's Crime. Upon which complaining to the Parliament, it was ordered that *Criton* should go immediately and speak to the Attorney-General, and that the Dispute should be deferred. *Criton* being heard, the next Day, as also the Doctors of the Canon-Law, it was ordered that the Parties should have speedy Audience; and in the mean time, *Criton* was forbid to propose, maintain, or dispute upon, the said Theses. This was done the seventeenth and eighteenth of this Month of January. We hope to go farther, and to make a good Decree, which shall be read in the Sorbonne, to forbid the Doctors maintaining such Propositions against the Doctrine of the Gallican Church.'

[B] His

(2) *Vossius* de Philosophia, cap. 9, pag. 74.

(3) Supposing him to be the Author of that Poem.

(4) *Vossius*, ubi supra, cap. 11, pag. 86, 87.

(1) *Lettres Françaises* écrites à *Scaliger*, pag. 256.

a Scotch Gentleman, a Counsellor to the Presidial of *Poitiers*, who was afterwards married again to *Francis de la Motte le Vayer* [B], after she had refused a Brother of the Constable de Luines [C]. Criton died the eighth of April, 1611 (b).

(b) De Beul, pag. 564.

(3) It should be of Paris; it was his Father who was of Mans.

[B] His Widow married again with Francis de la Motte le Vayer. I confess I have this only from the *Sorberiana*: there I find what follows: 'Franciscus Motta Pabyerius, of Mans (2), married the Daughter of Adam Blaciodeus, Counsellor of Poitiers, a learned Man; she was the Widow of Jacobus Critonius, Professor of human Learning at Paris. Le Vayer had his Collections, which he knew how to make good use of.'

[C] After she had refused a Brother of the Constable de Luines. We must not believe she was so delicate at the time that Mr Luines was Favourite and High-Constable. If it was true that she would not marry Mr Cadenet, it was before Mr Luines was taken in-

to Favour. I mention this with an if, because I have no other warrant for it than a Collection of Pieces against the Family of Luines. Now Writers of this kind of Satires are to be very much suspected: at all hazards I shall put down what I find in that Collection. 'Cadenet's presumption was not less gallant in pretending as he did in the Year 1618 to the Princess of Orange, Sister of the first Prince of the Blood, and Widow of a Sovereign Prince; Cadenet, I say, to whom the King's Nurse would not give her Daughter, and whom the Widow of Criton, a Greek Professor of Paris, refused to marry; and some time after this, you see he aspires to an Alliance with the Royal Blood (3).'

(3) This is taken from a Satire called, *La Comtadin Provençal*, inserted pag. 79, and following, of a Collection of the most curious Pieces made during the Reign of the Constable de Luines, printed in 1625, in 8vo: the Page I cite is pag. 103.

(a) His Scotch Name was Chreichion.

(b) De Larrey, Hist. of England, Tom. II, pag. 385.

(c) Pasquier, Catéch. des Jesuites, lib. 3, cap. 2, pag. m. 335.

CRITON (WILLIAM) (a), born in Scotland in the XVIIth Century, turned Jesuit in France, in the Seminary of Rheims (b). He was Rector of the Jesuits College at Lyons (c), and made himself famous, not by his Books, for I think he published none, but by State-Machinations, which would have been infinitely more useful, both to his Order, and to the Roman Catholic Cause, if they had succeeded, than a hundred Volumes. He often passed and repassed the Sea and the Alps, full of Intrigues and Plots, tending to re-establish the *Romish* Religion in Great Britain. Nevertheless, if we may believe a Letter he wrote to *Walsingham*, he did not approve of establishing the Kingdom of God by wicked Methods [A]; and he utterly condemned the Design of killing Queen Elizabeth, upon which he was consulted by *William Parry*. He was taken by the Privateers of

[A] If we may believe a Letter he wrote to *Walsingham*, he did not approve of establishing the Kingdom of God by wicked Methods. I shall produce part of the Narrative, which Mr de Larrey gives us of this *William Parry's* Confession. 'Morgan told him that all the Catholic Church expected from his Courage some bright Actions; this wretch assured him he was ready to stab to the Heart the first Lord in the Kingdom. And why not the Queen, interrupted Morgan? And the Queen also, if they can make it appear to me that it is lawful; but the Jesuit *Vatres* (1) is not of that Opinion. He added, that Criton, the Scotch Jesuit, also was not of that Opinion; and to deter him from it, he alleged, that great Principle, that the natural, as well as the Divine, Law teaches all Men not to commit a Crime, with an Intention to serve God. That he had strongly maintained this Doctrine of Morality, insisting upon one Saying, of which he made a kind of Demonstration, that God loved Adverbs rather than Nouns; that is to say, that he was more pleased with that which was well and lawfully done, than with that which was good and lawful (2). This *William Parry*, being convicted of the execrable Design to kill the Queen, was executed for it the second of March 1585 (3). His Trial was first printed at London, in English; but there is a French Translation of it, in the first Volume of the Memoirs of the League, which I have just now consulted; but do not find that Parry ever made mention of our Criton, either by word of Mouth, or by writing; and I observe, that Camden, reporting this Man's Confession, has inserted, by way of Parenthesis (4), what concerns the Opinion of this Jesuit. *Thuanus* does likewise speak of it, not as a thing contained in the Confession of the Criminal, but as an accessory Fact, and discovered another way. However it is true, that the Articles of the Trial discover the Maxims of the Jesuit Criton; for they contain a Letter he wrote to *Walsingham* (5), wherein he has explained them very clearly. He was a Prisoner in the Tower of London, during Parry's Trial, and being examined by *Walsingham*, whether the Accused had ever said any thing to him in France, or elsewhere, concerning the Question, if it was lawful to kill her Majesty, he answered he did not remember that he had; but afterwards recollecting himself, he writ of his own Free-will to the Secretary (6), concerning that Fact, and all with his own Hand, in the manner following. Then follows his Letter in pag. 42 of the first Volume of the Memoirs of the League.

I with the same Trial had informed us, whether they communicated this Letter to *William Parry*. Equity required it; for a Declaration made in the Tower of London is not much to be depended upon. Criton would have been far from consenting in that place that he had approved Parry's Design. To know then if he told the Truth, his Letter ought to have been shewn to the Criminal, or he should have been asked what Conversations he had had with Criton, concerning this wicked Attempt. If Parry had confessed that the Jesuit had plainly condemned the Proposal of killing the Queen, we should have had a certain Proof of Criton's Orthodoxy on that Head; but the Acts of the Trial furnish us with nothing but the Evidence, which *William Criton*, a Prisoner, gives of himself. However, I suppose, *William Parry* was examined upon this Article, though the Account of the Proceedings against him makes no mention of it; and consequently that what de Larrey advances is not without Foundation. For here is what is reported by *Richeome*: 'The Queen — ordered Parry to be asked if he knew *William Criton*, the Scotch Jesuit, who answered yes; and that he had formerly dissuaded him from this Enterprize, when he asked his Advice at Lyons. The Queen was astonished at this Justification, and, to be better informed, commanded her Secretary, *Francis Walsingham*, to know of Criton, if Parry had communicated nothing to him in France, or elsewhere, of his Affair. *Walsingham* immediately went to Criton and asked him, &c. (7). *Richeome* adds, what I have said before (8), and gives Criton's Letter entire, taken from the Memoirs of the League, after which he goes on in this manner: 'The Queen having heard the Contents of this Letter. How then? says she, they publish that the Jesuits would kill me in England, and this Jesuit defends me in France. She commanded afterwards that he should be set at Liberty, and his Letter published, not so much to favour him, as to let the People know that the Jesuits did not teach it was lawful to kill the Queen (9). There might be more Policy than Sincerity in these words of the Queen: for she well knew Criton's Innocence did not clear the two Jesuits, that Parry had named, as Approvers of his Treason (10). Let us say then, that *Richeome* has drawn too extensive a Consequence from the Letter of Criton, when he says: 'So far are ours from being the Authors of this treasonable Attempt of Parry, that, on the contrary, they hindered it to the utmost of their Power, according to the Evidences even of our Enemies. For the Hi-

(7) *Richeome*, Plainte Apologétique, pag. 166.

(3) *Citat.* (3).

(9) *Richeome*, ubi supra, pag. 168, 169.

(10) One was *Benedict Palmio*; he had consulted him at Venice: the other was *Hannibal Co-detti*; he had confided to him at Paris.

Roxy

(a) De Larrey, Hist. d'Angleterre, Tom. II, pag. 392.

(3) *Thuanus*, lib. 79, at the end, puts it 1584, not observing that the English begin their Year, in the public Records, the 25th of March.

(4) It is printed in a character different from what goes before and follows.

(5) See Memoirs of the League, Tom. I, pag. 42, and following.

(6) That is to say, *Francis Walsingham*.